



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/458,579	12/09/1999	MILES B. BRENNAN	3718-6	9014

7590

01/11/2002

JOSEPH E KOVARIK
SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 802025141

EXAMINER

SEHARASEYON, JEGATHEESAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2002

rd

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/458,579

Applicant(s)

BRENNAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jegatheesan Seharaseyon

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 15-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 15 and 16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 and 17-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 14.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment and response filed on 10/15/01 in Paper No: 13. Claims 1-9 and 15-29 are pending.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U. S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

35 USC § 112, second paragraph rejections withdrawn

3. Applicant's arguments and amendments have obviated the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention in claims 1-9 and 13.

35 USC § 103, rejections are withdrawn

4. Rejection under 35 USC 103, for being obvious over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,932,779) in view of Boston et al. (1996) in claims 1-9 and 15-21 are withdrawn in favor of rejection under 35 USC 102 in claims 6-9 and 17-21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6-9 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boston et al. (1996).

The instant invention is directed to a method of identifying compounds that regulate peripheral pathways of energy homeostasis.

Boston et al. teaches the method for pharmacological characterization of MC2 and MC5 receptors which are found in the peripheral tissue such as adipocytes (abstract). They also teach that the adipocyte response to the melanocortin peptides results from the expression of both MC2 and MC5 receptors. Furthermore, they suggest that MC2 receptor may also be involved in the energy homeostasis. Therefore, the disclosure of Boston et al. anticipates claims 6-9 and 17-21 (Page: 2049).

New Ground of Rejections

The following is a new ground of rejection necessitated by applicants' addition of claims 22-29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6a. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the

Art Unit: 1647

application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. *This is a written description rejection.*

The specification discloses peripheral melanocortin receptors MC2 and MC5. This meets the written description and enablement provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, the specification does not disclose other peripheral melanocortin receptors. The claims as written, however, encompasses other peripheral melanocortin receptors which were not originally contemplated and fail to meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, because the written description is not commensurate in scope with the recitation of claims 22-29. The specification does not provide written support for the genus encompassed by the instant claims.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

With the exception peripheral melanocortin receptors MC2 and MC5, the skilled artisan cannot envision all the detailed chemical structure of the claimed peripheral melanocortin receptors, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The polypeptide itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes v. Baird*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class.

Therefore, only the peripheral melanocortin receptors MC2 and MC5, but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed are not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. As a result, it does not appear that the inventors were in possession of various peripheral melanocortin receptors set forth in claims 22-29.

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.) Applicants are directed to the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999.

6b. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue" include, but are not limited to: (1) the breadth of the claims; (2) the nature of the

Art Unit: 1647

invention; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the level of one of ordinary skill; (5) the level of predictability in the art; (6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (7) the existence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The specification discloses peripheral melanocortin receptors MC2 and MC5. The specification does not teach other peripheral melanocortin receptors expressed in the peripheral tissues. There is no correlation of other melanocortin receptors modulating the physiological signals and no working examples. Despite knowledge in the art obtaining other receptor polypeptides, the specification fails to provide any guidance regarding these receptor polypeptides. Furthermore, detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the disclosed protein is lacking. Although it is accepted that the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, predicting a protein's structure and function from mere sequence data remains an elusive task. Applicants have not taught how one of skill in the art would use the full scope of receptors encompassed by the invention of claims. The specification as filed does not sufficiently teach one of skill in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed sequences. The amount of experimentation required to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed melanocortin receptor would require trial and error experimentation to determine the functional sequences. Given the breadth of claims 22-29 in light of the unpredictability of the art as determined by the lack of working examples and shown by the prior art of record, the level of skill of the artisan, and the lack of guidance provided in the instant specification,

Art Unit: 1647

it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

7. Claims 1-5, 15 and 16 are allowed. Claims 6-9, 17-21 and 22-29 are rejected.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jegatheesan Seharaseyon whose telephone number is 703-305-1112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-4227 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

JS
December 24, 2001

Art Unit: 1647

invention; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the level of one of ordinary skill; (5) the level of predictability in the art; (6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (7) the existence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The specification discloses peripheral melanocortin receptors MC2 and MC5. The specification does not teach other peripheral melanocortin receptors expressed in the peripheral tissues. There is no correlation of other melanocortin receptors modulating the physiological signals and no working examples. Despite knowledge in the art obtaining other receptor polypeptides, the specification fails to provide any guidance regarding these receptor polypeptides. Furthermore, detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the disclosed protein is lacking. Although it is accepted that the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, predicting a protein's structure and function from mere sequence data remains an elusive task. Applicants have not taught how one of skill in the art would use the full scope of receptors encompassed by the invention of claims. The specification as filed does not sufficiently teach one of skill in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed receptors. The amount of experimentation required to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed melanocortin receptor would require trial and error experimentation to determine the functional sequences. Given the breadth of claims 22-29 in light of the unpredictability of the art as determined by the lack of working examples and shown by the prior art of record, the level of skill of the artisan, and the lack of guidance provided in the instant specification, it would require

Art Unit: 1647

undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

7. Claims 1-5, 15 and 16 are allowed. Claims 6-9, 17-29 are rejected.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jegatheesan Seharaseyon whose telephone number is 703-305-1112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-4227 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

JS
January 9, 2002


GARY L. KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600